

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present Amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-14, 23, 24, 28-31, 34-36, 45-47 and 49 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically on pages 39 and 40. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 7, 9, 12, 13, 23-24, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 45-47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,090 to Riggins, III (hereinafter, merely "Riggins") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0090217 to Limor et al. (hereinafter, merely "Limor") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,106,360 (hereinafter, merely "Frederick").

Claims 8, 14, 30 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Riggins in view of Limor and Frederick and further in view of US 2005/0198668 A1 to Yuen, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Yuen").

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...a display for mapping positions of a plurality of movable bodies on the map and displaying a positional relationship between the movable bodies on the screen as a function of the multiplexing processing section,

wherein, when a specific object chasing function is selected, the display maps the positions of the specific object and plurality of movable bodies on the map, matches identification information of the specific object, and determines whether an image of an apparatus is showing the specific object,

wherein, if the specific object chasing function determines that the specific object is included in the image of an imaging apparatus, the image of the imaging apparatus is selected,

wherein, if the specific object chasing function determines that the specific object is not included in the image of an imaging apparatus, the specific object chasing function estimates which imaging apparatus will show the specific object next, and selects the imaging apparatus that will show the specific object next.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for “mapping positions of a plurality of movable bodies on a map and displaying a positional relationship between the movable bodies on the screen” using “GPS position information received from the movable body, GPS position information and imaging area information received from an imaging apparatus” and “mapping information.” As recited above, “ if the specific object chasing function is selected, the display maps the positions of the specific object and the plurality of movable bodies on the map, matches identification information of the specific object, and determines whether an image of an apparatus is showing the specific object.” Claim 1 also recites, if the specific object chasing function determines that the specific object is included in the image of an imaging apparatus, the image of the imaging

apparatus is selected.” On the other hand, “if the specific object chasing function determines that the specific object is not included in the image of an imaging apparatus, the specific object chasing function estimates which imaging apparatus will show the specific object next, and selects the imaging apparatus that will show the specific object next.”

Applicants submit that Riggins, Limor, and Frederick, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or render predictable the above identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
Brian M. McGuire
Reg. No. 55,445
(212) 588-0800